

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 5, 9, 18, 24, 26, 28, 30 and 35 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly not being enabling. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly not being directed to statutory subject matter. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Perge *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0014373), hereafter “Perge,” in view of Jarske (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2001/0023477 A1), hereafter “Jarske.”

A. OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The Office has objected to the drawings as not containing a flowchart of the process claims. Applicants respectfully traverse and state that the MPEP does not require a flow chart in this instance, but rather states that “...flow charts or source code listings are not a requirement for adequately disclosing the functions of software.” MPEP 2163(I)(A). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-35 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

The Office has asserted that claims 1-35 contain subject matter that is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art which it pertains or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, the Office states that there are limitless possibilities as to what “venture information” could be and that the term “venture” involves uncertainty. Office Action, page 2. Applicants have amended claims 1, 9 and 14 to further clarify the term. Furthermore, the preamble to the claims pertain to the managing of information for establishing a relationship with a venture company. As such, even assuming the Office to be correct in its assertion regarding venture information in general, the specification (see e.g., page 9, lines 10-11) contains a definition and examples of the type venture information that is the subject of this invention, including “...information pertaining to a venture company (e.g., business plan, customers, predicted sales, etc.).” Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passage, *inter alia*, provide an adequate definition for the term that would allow those knowledgeable in the art to practice the invention.

The Office also objects to term, “providing scoring data”, of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that examples of providing the scoring data that is then entered into the database are provided, *inter alia*, on page 17, lines 8-18 of the original specification. Furthermore, with respect to the analyzing of and deploying of the relationship that is also objected to by the Office, Applicants submit that the these features of the claimed invention are provided, *inter alia*, on page 17, line 19 through page 18, line 7 of the original specification.

The Office also states that providing of a single record of relationship information is not adequately described. Applicants respectfully direct the Office to page 22, line 17 through page

23, line 19, which describes several ways in which this can be accomplished. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejections.

C. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-35 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Office has asserted that claim 5 is indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Office indicates that the limitations “an original column” and “a duplicate column” do not convey the meaning that Applicants intend. Applicants, in a previous amendment, amended claim 5 to recite replace “original column” with “previous column” and to replace “duplicate column” with “subsequent column.” Applicants assert that this amendment further clarifies the invention. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

D. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office has rejected claims 1-16 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office asserts that the claimed invention does not produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. In making this rejection, the Office echoes the points made in its rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicants incorporate the arguments recited herein with respect to the previous rejection. Further, Applicants respectfully submit, the preamble of the claims themselves provide a use, to wit, “for managing information for establishing a relationship with a venture company.” This function involves a transformation, e.g., the gathering, storing, processing, etc., a data used to determine whether a relationship is to be established. In addition, the providing of a single record of relationship information

pertaining to the venture company, in and of itself gives a tangible result, *to wit*, the output of a record of relationship information. To this extent, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

E. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-35 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Perge and Jarske, Applicants initially respectfully submit that the rejection is incomplete. Specifically, the Office indicates that the rejection is over Perge in view of Jarske. However, in the body of its arguments, the Office cites passages of a previously cited reference, i.e., Chandler, in support of its arguments. To this extent, Applicants respectfully submit the following arguments in response to the Office's detailed arguments and respectfully request that the Office clarify its Office Action.

Applicants assert that the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 9, 14, 15, 21, 26, 27, 30 and 32, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest entering the venture information into a database having a column-row matrix of records having a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns. The Office admits that Chandler does not discuss the type of database used and or how the data stored in it is searched or queried. Instead, the Office cites a passage of Jarske that describes single row memories. Para. 0012; see also FIGS. 2 and 6. However, Jarske does not teach or suggest a column-row matrix of records having a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns.

In contrast, the claimed invention includes "...entering the venture information into a

database having a column-row matrix of records having a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns.” Claim 1. As such, the database of the claimed invention is not set of single row memories as in Jarske, but instead has a column-row matrix of records having a plurality of rows and a plurality of columns. For the above reasons, the database having a column-row matrix of records of the claimed invention is not taught by the memories of Jarske. Perge does not appear to cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With further respect to independent claims 9, 26 and 30 and with respect to dependent claims 5, 18, 24, 28 and 35, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest duplicating the single record from a original column of the queried row to a duplicate column of the queried row. The Office admits that Chandler does not teach this feature. Instead, the Office relies on passage of Jarske that recites, in part,

The invention’s goal is achieved with parallel memory updating, which takes place by using two memories side by side by copying a bit row from the first memory (or memory section) to a bit row in the second memory (or memory section). The rows in the first memory are old (not updated) and the rows formed in the second memory are new (updated). The new fixed bit column is added as the second memory’s first column and the old rows of the first memory are copied after the second memory’s first column, based on the BMU’s information, so that the first memory’s first column is the second memory’s second column and the first memory’s second last column is the second memory’s last column. Para. 0012.

To this extent, Jarske teaches copying data from column 1 of the old memory row to column 2 of the *new* memory and from column n of the old memory to column n+1 of the *new* memory. As such, the copying of Jarske is from a row to a different row and not from an original column to a duplicated column in the same queried row. In contrast, the claimed invention includes “...duplicating the single record from a original column *of the queried row* to a duplicate column

of the queried row.” Claim 9, emphasis added. As such, the duplicating of the claimed invention is not merely accessing and printing data from one memory to another as in Jarske, but rather duplicates a single record from a original column of a queried row to a duplicate column of the same queried row in the same database. Thus, the duplicating of the claimed invention is not taught by the accessing and downloading of Jarske. Perge does not appear to cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With further respect to independent claims 1, 9, 26, 27 and 30 and with respect to dependent claims 18, 24 and 35, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references also fail to teach querying a row of the database to provide a single record of relationship information pertaining to the venture company even if the single record of relationship information is not located in a specified row and column of the database. The Office admits that Chandler does not teach this feature of the claimed invention, but instead relies of a passage of Jarske that teaches copying data from column n of an old memory row into column $n+1$ of a new memory row. However, this passage of Jarske does not detail how the memory is queried, much less that a row may be queried to provide a single record (column) of information even if the single record is not located in a specified row and column of the database.

The claimed invention, in contrast, includes “...querying a row of the database to provide a single record of relationship information pertaining to the venture company even if the single record of relationship information is not located in a specified row and column of the database.” Claim 1. As such, the querying of the claimed invention is not unspecified, such as in Jarske, but rather provides a single record of relationship information pertaining to the venture company. Furthermore, the single record of the claimed invention is produced by querying a row of the

database. Still further, the single record of relationship information of the claimed invention is provided even if it is not located in the specified row and column of the database. For the above reasons, the querying of the claimed invention is not taught by Jarske. Perge does not appear to cure this deficiency. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to dependent claims 4 and 11, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest that each row of the matrix corresponds to a separate venture company, and wherein each column of the matrix corresponds to a separate time interval. The Office does not specifically address the claims or Applicants' arguments regarding the claims. Accordingly, Applicants will attempt to repeat and clarify the previously made arguments. The passage of Chandler that the Office equates with matrix rows corresponding to venture companies merely teaches a questionnaire that may be available for viewing. Nowhere, does this passage teach rows of a matrix that correspond to venture companies. Similarly, the Office equates the time interval columns of the matrix with a passage of Chandler that teaches a number of lists on which ranked companies may be placed. However, nowhere are entries on the list associated with time intervals. In contrast, the claimed invention includes "...the each row of the matrix corresponds to a separate venture company, and wherein each column of the matrix corresponds to a separate time interval." Claim 4. Thus, the non-related questionnaire and lists of Chandler do not teach the database of the claimed invention that has a row column matrix wherein each row of the matrix corresponds to a separate venture company and each column of the matrix corresponds to a separate time interval. Jarske does not cure this deficiency and, as stated herein, the Office does not make a showing to indicate that Perge does. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserve the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. These features have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 16, 2008

/ Hunter E. Webb /
Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)

RAD/hew